

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claim 1 is under consideration.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner has objected to the Specification, stating that “although the Specification contains a section entitled ‘Brief Description of the Drawings,’ there is no description of the eight figures...”

Applicants have amended the Specification to more specifically describe the figures as described on pages 8-10 of the Specification. Accordingly, basis for this amendment can be found in the Specification as filed and specifically, at pages 8-10. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the present objection is now moot.

THE §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph alleging that the Specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to practice the invention commensurate with the scope of the claims as filed. The Examiner stated that the Specification does not reasonably provide enablement for an isolated soluble receptor comprising the IL-20R alpha subunit and the IL-20R beta subunit alone (*i.e.* without a peptide linker) or for a peptide linker that comprises between 100-240 amino acid resides.

Applicants traverse. Applicants had previously amended the claims to be directed to an isolated receptor, as opposed to a soluble receptor. The claimed isolated IL-20 receptor comprises full-length IL-20R alpha and IL-20R beta subunits. Accordingly, a polypeptide linker to join together the extracellular domains is no longer necessary. However, in order to expedite prosecution and allowance of the present invention, Applicants have amended claim 1 to now recite a functional amendment. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “an isolated IL-20 receptor” that “binds to IL-20.” And, as stated by the Examiner, “[e]xample 3 ... demonstrates that the IL-20R heterodimer binds to IL-20. However, Applicants respectfully note that Example 3 is directed to the transient transfection of both IL-20R alpha and IL-20R beta into

09/745,792

Foster et al.

Response to the March 9, 2005 Office Action

Dated: July 1, 2005

COS cells, and thus shows binding of IL-20 *without a polypeptide linker*. Accordingly, in light of the above amendments, Applicants believe that the present rejection is now moot.

THE §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite.

Applicants have cancelled claims 2-7 and amended claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the present rejection is now moot.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the Application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: February 3, 2006

Shelby J. Walker, Reg. No. 45,192
Attorney for Applicants
c/o ZYMOGENETICS, INC.

1201 Eastlake Avenue East
Seattle, Washington 98102-3702
Tel: (206) 442-6558
Fax: (206) 442-6678

Enclosures:

- Petition and Fee for Extension of Time (in duplicate)
- Amendment Fee Transmittal (in duplicate)
- Postcard

H:\Patents\Shelby\99-107\US\Response to the March 9 2005 Office Action.doc